



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

54

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/841,007	04/25/2001	Jae Kyung Lee	P-220	4930
34610	7590	01/14/2005	EXAMINER	
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP P.O. BOX 221200 CHANTILLY, VA 20153			BELIVEAU, SCOTT E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/841,007

Applicant(s)

LEE, JAE KYUNG

Examiner

Scott Beliveau

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 April 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Priority***

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: "S34" (Figure 3A) and "S51" (Figure 4). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

3. The disclosure is objected to because reference to “memory unit 7” should be amended to reference “memory unit 8” in order to be consistent with the Figures (Page 7, Line 7).

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the phrase “the translation site” lacks proper antecedent basis as it is unclear as to whether the phrase “the translation site” refers to the prior recitation of either the “translation relay site server” or the “translation relay site” or a new element as reflected in Figure 2. For the purpose of art evaluation, the examiner shall presume that the “translation site” is referencing a separate element.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thrift (US Pat No. 6,510,557) in view of Goldberg et al. (US Pat No. 6,161,082).

In consideration of claim 1, the Thrift reference discloses a “TV” receiver [10] (Col 3, Lines 1-5) that is “capable of contacting to an internet site” [14] (Col 2, Lines 36-53) comprising a “control unit” [12] for “receiving character information” and a “video processing unit” [32] for displaying “received character information” associated with Internet chat-rooms on a “screen” [40] (Col 3, Lines 17-40; Col 4, Line 54 – Col 5, Line 9). The reference, however, does not disclose nor preclude the particularly claimed technique pertaining to translating received character information into a user-selected language.

The Goldberg et al. reference discloses a method for facilitating communications between users of interconnected communication terminals [100/110/120] through the usage of “chat-rooms”. In particular, the reference discloses a technique for “receiving character information translated into a user selection language” and implicitly “displaying the received character information on a screen” associated with receiving party so as to facilitate an interactive chat-session (Figure 2; Col 3, Lines 21-48). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art so as to apply the translation teachings of Goldberg et al. to the Thrift apparatus for facilitating Internet based chat-room communication for the purpose of advantageously taking advantage of the increased processing power available to a network based translation system in order to advantageously facilitate the expansion of communication between users in a chat-room environment that speak a variety of languages (Goldberg et al.: Col 1, Line 64 – Col 2, Line 29).

Claim 12 is rejected in view of the aforementioned rejection of claim 1 based upon the combination of Thrift and Goldberg et al. In particular, the Thrift reference discloses a “TV” receiver [10] comprising a “network interface unit” [14] adapted to contact a number of

Internet based web sites, an implicit “storage unit” for “storing contact information” associated with Internet chat-rooms that may further serve as a “translations sites corresponding to various languages” (in view of Goldberg et al.) and an “operation program” such as a web-browser (Col 3, Line 41 – Col 4, Line 46), a “control unit” [12] for “receiving character information” associated with a web-site based chat-room, and a “video processing unit” [32] for displaying “received character information” associated with Internet chat-rooms on a “screen” [40] (Col 3, Lines 17-40; Col 4, Line 54 – Col 5, Line 9). The reference, however, does not disclose nor preclude the particularly claimed technique associated with the utilization of “language selection” associated with the facilitation of the aforementioned Internet chat-room.

As aforementioned, the Goldberg et al. reference discloses a method for facilitating communications between users of interconnected communication terminals [100/110/120] through the usage of “chat-rooms”. In particular, the reference discloses a technique for “contacting a translation site” associated with the aforementioned chat-room, “transmitting character information to be translated in accordance with the operation program related to translation”, “receiving character information translated into a user selection language” and implicitly “displaying the received character information on a screen” associated with receiving party so as to facilitate an interactive chat-session (Figure 2; Col 3, Lines 21-48). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art so as to apply the translation teachings of Goldberg et al. to the Thrift apparatus for facilitating Internet based chat-room communication for the purpose of advantageously taking advantage of the increased processing power available to a network based translation system in order to

advantageously facilitate the expansion of communication between users in a chat-room environment that speak a variety of languages (Goldberg et al.: Col 1, Line 64 – Col 2, Line 29).

Claims 2 and 13 are rejected wherein the Thrift reference further comprises an “audio processing unit” [38] for “processing audio information synchronized with the translated character information” such that the broadcast program with its associated audio is simultaneously presented with the translated text from the chat-room. Goldberg et al. further facilitates the translation from text-to-audio or audio-to-text (Col 7, Lines 18-25).

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected wherein the “TV” [10] of Thrift further comprises a “storage unit” for “storing contact information” in the form of a “URL (Universal Resource Locator)” of “a translation relay site” such that the system, taken in combination, captures a URL associated with the chat-server providing the synchronized web-page or “translation relay site” in view of the combined references (Thrift: Col 4, Line 54 – Col 5, Line 8).

Claims 5 and 15 are rejected wherein the “control unit contacts [the] . . . translation relay site server by using” the “contact information” or the “URL of the translation relay site and receives the translated character information from the server” for display (Goldberg et al.: Figure 2).

Claim 6 is rejected wherein the “control unit contacts to the translation relay site server through a network interface unit” [14] (Col 2, Lines 36-43).

Claims 7, 8, and 16 are rejected wherein the “translation relay site server receives character information and language information . . .” wherein the “language information . . . is a language selected by a user”. The “translation relay site server” subsequently “translates

Art Unit: 2614

the transmitted character information into a language corresponding to the language information and transmits it to the control unit” in conjunction with a translation site [160/170] (Goldberg et al.: Figure 2; Col 5, Line 25-50).

Claims 9, 10, and 17 are rejected in light of the combined references. In particular, the Thrift reference provides a portal for the chat-room which serves as a relay to the translation site associated with the Goldberg et al. reference. Accordingly, the “translation site is inputted the character information to be translated from the translation relay site server” associated with the user submitted chat-text, “translates it into the language selected by the user”, and “provides it to the translation relay site server” associated with the server generating the chat-room web page whereupon the “translation relay server” which was subsequently “provided the translated character information from the translation site corresponding to the language selected by the user” is “transmitted . . . to the control unit” for display the translated format to the end-user.

Claims 11 and 14 are rejected wherein the “control unit embodies an OSD (On Screen Display) about the received character information and provides it to the video processing unit in order to display the embodied OSD on a screen” (Thrift: Figure 3).

In consideration of claim 18, the Thrift reference discloses a control method of a “TV” receiver [10] (Col 3, Lines 1-5) comprising “receiving character information” and displaying the “received character information” associated with Internet chat-rooms on a “screen” [40] (Col 3, Lines 17-40; Col 4, Line 54 – Col 5, Line 9). The reference, however, does not disclose nor preclude the particularly claimed technique pertaining to translating received character information into a user-selected language. As aforementioned, the Goldberg et al.



Art Unit: 2614

reference discloses a technique for “receiving character information translated into a user selection language” and implicitly “displaying the received character information on a screen” associated with receiving party so as to facilitate an interactive chat-session (Figure 2; Col 3, Lines 21-48). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art so as to apply the translation teachings of Goldberg et al. to the Thrift apparatus for facilitating Internet based chat-room communication for the purpose of advantageously taking advantage of the increased processing power available to a network based translation system in order to advantageously facilitate the expansion of communication between users in a chat-room environment that speak a variety of languages (Goldberg et al.: Col 1, Line 64 – Col 2, Line 29).

Claim 19 is rejected wherein the Goldberg et al. reference discloses that the system “judges whether a language of character information included in a broadcast signal corresponds to a language selected by the user” and “transmits the character information . . . to a translation relay site server” associated with the “translation site” [160/170] of the chat-room “when the language of the character information included in the broadcast signal is different from the language selected by the user . . . in order to translate it into the language selected by the user” (Figure 2). The user subsequently, “receives the character information translated into the language selected by the user form the translation site” for display as previously set forth.

Claim 20 is rejected wherein the system in taken in combination is operable to “request translation by transmitting the character information to the translation site”, and “receiving the translated character information from the translation site” (Goldberg et al.: Figure 2)

Art Unit: 2614

such that the “contact information” associated with the “translation site” or chat-room is “stored in advance” given that the user must have received and stored the contact information associated with the chat-room translation site in the first place.

Claim 21 is rejected wherein the “language information is user language information for defining kinds of language selected by a user” [205] and “character language information defining kinds of language of character information including a broadcast signal” [210] originating from one of the terminals to the plurality of other terminals (Goldberg et al.: Col 6, Lines 13-37).

Claim 22 is rejected wherein the “translation site contact information stored in advance is updated periodically” in conjunction with the changing of the broadcast program.

In consideration of claim 23, as aforementioned, the combined teachings of Thrift and Goldberg et al. references discloses a “TV” receiver [10] (Thrift: Col 3, Lines 1-5) that facilitates a connection to a “to an internet translation site corresponding to the user selection language among preset internet translation sites” [160/170] such as that supplied by Goldberg et al. and is adapted to “display” both the “translated character information on a screen” [40] and “audio information synchronized with it from the internet translation site” [38] associated with the broadcast program. As previously set forth, the reference is silent as to the particular usage of translation software in conjunction with the facilitation of the Internet chat-sessions.

The Goldberg et al. reference discloses an Internet based translation services for chat-sessions including “judging whether a language of character information included in a broadcast signal corresponds to a user selection language” (ex. character information is

“broadcast” from terminal “100” to both terminals “120” and “110”) whereupon the system subsequently “requests translation by contacting to an internet translation site . . . when the language of the character information included in the broadcast signal is different from the user selection language” (Goldberg et al.: Figure 2). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art so as to apply the translation teachings of Goldberg et al. to the Thrift apparatus for facilitating Internet based chat-room communication for the purpose of advantageously taking advantage of the increased processing power available to a network based translation system in order to advantageously facilitate the expansion of communication between users in a chat-room environment that speak a variety of languages (Goldberg et al.: Col 1, Line 64 – Col 2, Line 29).

### *Conclusion*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as follows. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objections made.

- The Chang (US Pat No. 5,543,851) reference discloses a closed caption processing system that translates the received information into a requested language.
- The Flanagan et al. (WO 97/18516) reference discloses a system that translates character information or HTML documents from one language into another using either a local or server based translator.

Art Unit: 2614

- The Harrison (US Pat No. 5,694,163) reference discloses a system and method for communicating chat-room data through the VBI.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Beliveau whose telephone number is 703-305-4907.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 a.m. - 6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 703-305-4795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SEB  
January 10, 2005

  
JOHN MILLER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600